

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY WAYNE JOHNSON, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

M. GAINS *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil No. 09cv1312-LAB (POR)

**MODIFIED ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE FOURTH AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

[ECF No. 52]

On March 7, 2011, the Court issued an Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Fourth Amended Complaint. In that Order, the Court erroneously directed the Clerk to issue a summons upon Defendants as to Plaintiff's Fourth Amended Complaint. Accordingly, the Court has modified its March 7, 2011 order as follows.

On February 10, 2010, Plaintiff Anthony Wayne Johnson, Jr., a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed a Third Amended Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against ten California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation officials.¹ (ECF No. 23.) On June 3, 2010, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 40.) While Defendants' motion was pending, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to File a Fourth Amended

¹ On June 8, 2009, Plaintiff filed a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. 1.) On August 19, 2009, the Honorable Larry A. Burns dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(b) and 1915A(b). (Doc. 4.) Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint on September 11, 2009. (Doc. 8.) On October 8, 2009, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(b) and 1915A(b). (Doc. 11.) On October 28, 2009, Plaintiff filed his Second Amended Complaint. (Doc. 14.) Again, on November 9, 2009, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(b) and 1915A(b). (Doc. 15.)

1 Complaint.² (ECF No. 52.) Defendants have not opposed Plaintiff's motion.

2 On January 26, 2011, this Court issued a Report and Recommendation that Defendants'
3 Motion to Dismiss be granted in part and denied in part. (ECF No. 50.) Specifically, the Court
4 recommended granting the following claims without prejudice: (1) Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment
5 excessive force claims against Defendants Gains, Holmstrom and Beltran; (2) Plaintiff's claims
6 against Defendant Cate; and (3) Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. (*Id.* at 12.) On February 24,
7 2011, the Honorable Larry A. Burns issued an order adopting this Court's recommendation to grant
8 in part and deny in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. (ECF No. 53.)

9 Leave to amend should be freely given "when justice so requires." Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a)(2).
10 Furthermore, "[t]his policy is applied even more liberally to pro se litigants." *Eldridge v. Block*, 832
11 F.2d 1132, 1135 (9th Cir. 1987). Here, Plaintiff requests to amend his complaint only to include
12 "more details and evidence to support his claims." (ECF No. 52 at 1.) Based on a review of the
13 proposed Fourth Amended Complaint, and for the reasons set forth in this Court's previous Report
14 and Recommendation Order, the Court hereby **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion to Amend.
15 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 16 1. The Clerk of Court shall file Plaintiff's Fourth Amended Complaint (Doc. 52-1) as a
17 new entry on the docket of this case.
- 18 2. Defendants are thereafter ORDERED to reply to Plaintiff's Fourth Amended
19 Complaint within the time provided by the applicable provisions of Federal Rule of
20 Civil Procedure 12(a).

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 DATED: March 8, 2011

23 
24 LOUISA S PORTER
25 United States Magistrate Judge

26 cc The Honorable Larry A. Burns
27 All parties

28 ² Plaintiff submitted a proposed Fourth Amended Complaint as an exhibit to his motion. (ECF No. 52, Ex. 1.)